

Can the Integral Complementarity of Woman and Man be Proved?

22nd Annual Aquinas Lecture

Thomas Aquinas Week

Aquinas College

Grand Rapids, Michigan

January 31, 2013 7pm

Sr. Prudence Allen, RSM, PhD

Introduction:

Approach and Basic Terms

+
Gloria to the Father and to the Son
and to the Holy Spirit -

Many Sects of Wisdom - pag fans

outline . . . I 750-1250
II 1250-1500
III →
for evidence

In the great drama of the history of western thought about the concept of woman

in relation to man, Thomas Aquinas' observation at the beginning of the *Summa*

Theologica proves correct. When he asked the question 'Why something other than

philosophy is needed for salvation?', a part of his answer claimed that even after

philosophers do the hard work of reasoning, their answers often contained errors. In forty

years of research most, if not all philosophers have an admixture of truth and error. For

example, while Plato was correct about the need for equality between women and men,

he was wrong about a unisex soul and dualism; and while Aristotle was correct about the

soul/body composite (*hylomorphic*) structure of the human being, he was wrong about

male-female differentiation in his theory of generation.

In certain key areas of human identity, philosophy needs theology as an anchor

for truth about the human person and about man and woman as two ways of being a

human person. Both philosophy and theology are needed to develop an answer to the

question: Can Complementarity of Woman and Man be Proved? What does the word

'proof' mean in this context? It does not refer to a deductive proof, where the conclusion

is contained in the premises; nor does it mean a simple inductive argument which offers a

conclusion that goes way beyond the premises. Both of these common proofs occur in a

single time-frame. Instead, the kind of proof needed to defend the theory of Integral

Joy takes here
Aquinas College

1) 6R.
1970

2) 1973
Michael
Tapsen
& Sandman

ESM at Mercy Hospital

Complementarity of Man and Woman will be, what Cardinal Newman describes as an historical proof of the truth of a living idea. It takes nearly two-thousand-five-hundred years to establish that this kind of complementarity can be proved.

Furthermore, it will be seen that the living idea of integral complementarity of woman and man requires a metaphysics of the human person as a soul/body composite. It also requires a metaphysics of relation. Newman offers seven criteria, which he calls 'notes,' by which to test an idea to see whether it can be considered true and living.

While Newman's *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* was written to defend an ecclesiology, his method of proof will be applied to defend two philosophical theories about real living things, women and men---their hylomorphic structure and their relations of integral complementarity.

The philosopher Heidegger, with his admixture of neglect of the human being and of ethics, and deep insight into the structure of language, argued that words should not be thought of like a bucket which could dip into the meaning of their ancient roots. Rather words should be considered like well springs, that need to be dug up again and again to provide fresh meaning from pure sources. It could even be said that some words spring up with living water unto eternal life. The root 'gen' in the words generation, engender, genealogy, generate, gens, and gender, is such a well spring. It means to breed, to reproduce, from the union of male and female, man and woman. It contains within its well-spring the reality of intergenerational families as in the Genealogy of Genesis 5; and it includes extended families of brothers and sisters and their children generated from the same parents.

Included in the meaning of the root gen is the word 'sex', which means to cut, to separate, to distinguish. The union of 'gen' is only possible with the included foundation of 'sex', in the human family, of male and female as two ways of being human.

Consequently, the phrase integral gender complementarity includes sex complementarity.

The three basic theories of relation of woman and man, [gender polarity, gender unity=unisex, and gender complementarity], and their sub-categories [traditional gender polarity and reverse gender polarity] and [integral complementarity and fractional gender complementarity] include sex. The soul/body composite structure of each living human being keeps the center of integration of this living woman or man; its rejection leads to fragmentation and even into the culture of death.

With this approach and basic terms explained, let's begin to open up the great drama of the history of thought about woman and man in Western philosophy. I will try to describe the main moments in the development of the two original types of ideas. The evidence for my claims can be found in the volumes of *The Concept of Woman* where each author is described in some depth and exact references provided.

Original Type of Living Idea of the Human Being: Male or Female

The Presocratic philosophers provided only fragments of the concept of woman in relation to man that can be summarized as having the following components [opposites, generation, wisdom, and virtue]. Plato was the first philosopher to try to offer a comprehensive theory about the respective identities of women and men. He introduced a metaphysical dualism of soul reincarnating into different kinds of bodies. In the Republic, Book V, he had the character Socrates argue that the fact that a male begets and

a female bears is not a significant difference for their respective place in this utopian society. In short, Plato defended a unisex theory, that men and women were by nature equal (although the female a little weaker) and they had no significant differences.

Aristotle provided a comprehensive argument defending instead that male and female were significantly different, and also that they were not equal, with the female being a derived or imperfect male. Aristotle also divided areas of study so that the foundation for different sciences were laid out. In the science of the generation of animals he correctly stated that in higher animals the males generated outside the self and the females generated inside the self. However, in his hypothesis about how exactly this differentiated generation took place, Aristotle made a serious error that took over 2000 years to be corrected. Specifically, Aristotle thought that only the male provided a single fertile seed power in sexual intercourse, and the female provided no fertile seed, but only the matter in blood.

The woman's natural inferiority to the man in generation was based in a theory of contrariety in which a female was the privative contrary of the male like cold is the privative contrary of heat. The woman's natural metaphysical and scientific inferiority to man had consequences for her being wise through true opinion and virtuous through obedience and remaining in the private sphere of activity. This comprehensive theory of Aristotle provided the first example of the traditional gender polarity, i.e., there are significant differences between man and woman and man was by nature superior to woman.

Even with his erroneous basis for the devaluation of woman, Aristotle nevertheless provided the first type of the true living idea of metaphysical hylomorphism,

every living being, including a human being, has the metaphysical structure of a form/matter composite. In higher living beings, the form is called a soul and the matter a body. The soul is the source of the life of the human being, of its operations of nutrition, locomotion, reproduction, external and internal, sensation, passions, and the rational faculty. This original living idea will develop over the centuries until its incorporation of a corrected science of generation will provide the context for a renewed integral complementarity of woman and man in the work of John Paul II. This will demonstrate Newman's first criteria or note of a true development as it will preserve the identity of the original type through all its apparent changes and vicissitudes from first to last.

Original Type of Living Idea of Complementarity: Man and Woman

Prime human type

For over eight hundred years Plato's unisex theory and Aristotle's gender polarity theory battled back and forth for dominance over the mind of philosophers. In the middle of these years, the Incarnation of Jesus Christ transformed the history of the world. One of the defining events of the Post Christian era was belief in the Resurrection of the Body, captured in the 4th clause of the Apostles Creed, 'I believe in the Communion of Saints, the Forgiveness of Sins, the Resurrection of the Body, and Life Everlasting.'

Augustine, in Book 17 Chapter 12 of the *City of God*, showed that he knew about the gender polarity theory when he wrote that some persons think that women will be changed into men in the resurrection, but he (Augustine) has no doubt that a woman's 'sex is her nature' and no defect and that there will be both men and women in heaven with the Resurrection of the Body. With this argument Augustine provided the first type of living idea of the complementarity of woman and man. With the admixture of truth

and error so common to philosophers, Augustine was not able to carry through his comprehensive theory. Rather he limited it to heaven, while on earth a woman in marriage was described in terms of the gender polarity theory; and a nun in terms of a unisex theory,

* **Preservation of Type, Continuity of Principles, and Assimilative Power of these two Living Ideas**

eminent womanly apt
Hildegard of Bingen, followed Augustine in appealing to the Resurrection of the body to describe women and men who will rise again in body and in soul 'in the integrity of their bodies and their sex.' She preserved the original type of living idea of complementarity, continued its principles of significant differentiation and fundamental equality, and assimilated the spiritual insight in the Apostles Creed.

In addition, St. Hildegard was the first person to elaborate a comprehensive theory of gender complementarity in heaven and on earth and across all four categories of the concept of woman. She balanced out some of the distortions of traditional polarity theories to bring about the fundamental equality and dignity of women and men, along with their significant differentiation. In addition, Hildegard brought to the forefront a synergetic dynamic so central to complementarity when she stated a man and woman were the work of one another on earth and in integral relations in heaven. Hildegard's development of complementarity

a
 Drawing upon the dated medieval science of humors and elements, Hildegard also initiated a theory of four kinds of men and four kinds of women, identified their bodily structures, and described their relation to generation and to various kinds of diseases. She

described a woman's experience of the gaze of a man for a woman, differentiating those whose eyes met in friendship, from those whose eyes were like arrows, from those who were violent, from those who were indifferent.

In these ways, Hildegard exemplifies Newman's characterization of the development of doctrine which occurred through the increase and expansion of the Christian Creed, taking possession of the intellect and heart and then taking time to comprehend and perfect the great ideas it contains.

Thomas of Aquinas also repeated the argument that at the Resurrection of the body, men and women will retain their equality and significant differentiation in heaven. He also began to develop a metaphysics of relationality drawing from his insight into the fact that relations are an essential characteristic of the Three Divine Persons in the Holy Trinity, and since human beings are created in the image and likeness of God, relationality must not be accidental to men and to women as Aristotle had thought, but rather equally primordial to their soul/body composite identity as living substances.

Thomas also provided another important development in his elaboration of the nature of the human soul. The same human soul had a dual capacity: it acted as form organizing its unique human body and it also acted as spirit in relation to other spirits (God, angels, and human beings). This insight preserved the original type of *hylomorphism* and its continuity of principles of a composite unity while it assimilated the Christian development in understanding that each human soul was created by God. In fact, in the *Summa Contra Gentiles* Thomas proposed that each human soul was 'commensurated' to a particular body. In this development, he avoided the difficulty

inherited from Aristotle and ^{namely} Albert his teacher, that each particular female was generated as a male that did not achieve its perfection. It may be that pondering the identity of Mary, Mother of God helped motivate ^{him to a better} finding another explanation for the generation of females.

With the usual admixture of truth and error in philosophers, Thomas did continue the no-fertile-female seed theory that by now, some seventeen thousand years after Aristotle had articulated it, had become an ideology. From our perspective of the development of the living ideas of *hylomorphism* and complementarity Thomas Aquinas made very important advancements moving the equality of women and men forward. He even argued, against Aristotle, who thought that men and women had friendships of inequality, that instead a wife had the greatest friendship with her husband in marriage.

In summary, Thomas Aquinas demonstrated the three criteria of Newman in the way he preserved and developed the original type and continuity of principles of *hylomorphism* and the assimilative power of it had for the creation of the human soul as both spirit and form in the soul/body composite and as commensurated to each individual male or female body. In addition, he provided a needed metaphysical foundation for relation as an essential characteristic of all human beings in assimilating the doctrine of relation as essential to the Divine Persons in the Holy Trinity.

Inevitable Conflict: Complementarity Threatened by Two Polarity Theories

In the next phase of development, while the living idea of *hylomorphism* remained steady the fragile beginnings of complementarity between men and women was seriously threatened in two separate ways: by a reassertion of the traditional sex

^{unlike its} polarity and ^{second} its multiple arguments for the natural superiority of man over woman and by the emergence of a reverse sex polarity which developed new arguments for the natural superiority of woman over man.

The reassertion of traditional polarity occurred through the influx in the mid-thirteenth century of translations of Aristotle's ^{from Greek into Latin} corpus and the requirement that they become required reading at the new universities beginning in Paris and extending over the next two hundred years throughout many major cities in Europe and England. Theories of complementarity had been developing in the older centers of education in the Benedictine monasteries where women as well as men were educated. The new universities were opened to men only not as an intentional exclusion of women but more as a de facto orientation towards educating priests, attorneys, and physicians.

New rationale for the natural inferiority of women flourished inside academia and outside in new satires devaluing women. These satires ridiculed women as passive, unable to control their emotions, or as cunning and leading men to their ruin. Marriage was depicted as a trap to destroy man. The *Malleus maleficarum* integrated Aristotelian arguments to use in witchcraft accusations and trials. In this attitude towards woman we can see what Newman describes as a corruption and even perversion of the principle of significant differentiation of man and woman.

In this context, in many Renaissance humanist situations, small study groups and schools began to emerge in family homes where both in experience and writing a complementarity quietly continued. Christine de Pizan, a mother and widow, who was befriended by Jean Gerson, the rector of the University of Paris and was given a study space in its library, emerged as an extraordinary defender of marriage, woman and man's

mutual dignity, and the basic principles of a Christian complementarity. Author of over ^{early on} 41 books, Christine de Pizan demonstrated where men's arguments that devalued women were fallacious and/or false. She explicitly defended the key components of equality and significant differentiation of man and woman as well as the importance of the synergetic collaboration of husband and wife in marriage. Christine de Pizan and other Catholic authors of Renaissance humanism kept the living idea of complementarity alive in written texts originating outside of the academic world.

In addition, the living idea of complementarity implicitly lived on in several religious men and women began to work together in relations of spiritual complementarity by renewing older religious communities (Teresa of Avila and St. John of the Cross) and beginning new religious communities (St. Vincent de Paul and Louise de Marillac or St. Francis de Sales and St. Jeanne de Chantal or Bishop Francois de Laval and Marie of the Incarnation). New spiritual forms of spiritual lay relations of complementarity also emerged (Paul Chomedey de Maisonneuve and Jean Mance and Marguerite Bourgeois in the founding of Montreal). Newman defended implicit knowledge as an important aspect of the development of a true living idea. Applying this aspect of his theory here, we can argue that just because persons may not articulate explicitly a theory of complementarity of women and men, they may still be possessed by the idea of complementarity and live their lives in accordance with it. In the twentieth century the fundamental developments in integral gender complementarity will be explicitly articulated.

The emergence of reverse gender polarity, or the theory that woman is naturally superior to man, was defended by Henrich Cornelius Agrippa, who argued that

since each kind of created being was superior to the previous one, and since woman was created last, the female must be superior to the male. It was also defended by Lucretia Marinella, who argued that women's virtues were superior to men's and men's vices were worse than women's; therefore, women are superior to men. At this time in history, reverse gender polarity was only an intellectual hypothesis, and it did not sustain itself for very long.

Inevitable Conflict: Cartesian Unisex Dualism Shattered the Unity of the Human Being and Strengthened Equality of Man and Woman

In later Renaissance humanism Plato's works, and especially the *Republic*, with its rationale for the equality and non-differentiation of woman and man flooded into northern Italy. Marsilio Ficino, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Nicholas of Cusa and others began to appeal to Neoplatonism to defend an equality of woman and man.

Rene Descartes, drawing upon a mathematical method of arguing, provided a further push towards a new philosophy by rejecting scholastic metaphysics and one of its key ideas of a substantial form. With the rejection of the metaphysical foundation of *hylomorphism*, complementarity theory lost its capacity to defend real and significant differentiation between women and men, and the unisex orientation of modern philosophy began its long lasting momentum.

In his *Meditations*, Descartes concluded that he is 'merely a thinking thing' really distinct from his body. The human soul with its many rich operations was flattened into simply a rational thinking mind; and the human organic body was turned into a kind of machine, like dead matter known only by its spatial extension.

The Cartesian mind had no sexually differentiated characteristics; its operations were listed as including simply reasoning, willing, thinking, doubting, etc. No longer did the human mind know something's essential identity by abstracting the form from a real existing thing. Instead, the object of the mind began to be mental objects. As some have said, Descartes ^{cut} the umbilical chord between the mind and reality. *I deas mens think, is*

One of the first consequences of the Cartesian turn to the subject was that philosophers began to use his unisex model of the mind to argue that women should have equal access to higher education as did men. Maria von Schurman, Poullain de la Barre, and Mary Astell wrote extensively on this subject. *Princess Elizabeth - of Schurman's engaged with Descartes in serious phil. Schurman - re. how mind/body is separated*

Joined with this phenomenon was the fact that most of these women were from movements of the Reformation where various Christian denominations began to formulate a way of thinking that eschewed any dependence on ancient or medieval philosophy's Aristotelian and scholastic foundations. The traditional polarity that followed along the Aristotelian pathway was rejected in favor of a new equality of women and men in a Cartesian unisex world.

Some more recent scholars have argued that there was a 'Cartesian flight from woman' because of Descartes' strong emphasis on discursive reason. Evidence suggests, with examples like Princess Elizabeth and others, however, that instead of fleeing from women, Descartes engaged in mature philosophical reasoning with them in letters and personal discussions.

Another consequence of the Cartesian unisex model of the human being was that several political philosophers used his premises to argue that women should be able to participate in political life as citizens and even as part of governing bodies. Marie Gouze

and the Marquis de la Condorcet both promoted women's participation in politics, and both were killed, not directly because of these views, but more for their broader political resistance to the direction of the French Revolution.

Complementarity Corrupted in Reform Theories of Differentiation of Man and Woman

Ironically, the Cartesian Rejection of form and his shattering of the soul/body unity of the human being will eventually provide the framework in which the identity of a man or a woman undergoes a systematic deconstruction. Even Descartes' model of the human being, with its unisex orientation founded only on a unisex mind, an 'I think', will not be able to sustain the foundation of equality with which it began. Therefore, while initially the premise of equality brought into the discussion of women and men a welcome elevation of one of the key components of an integral complementarity, soon it slid into a fractional complementarity with a hidden polarity.

The mind, detached from the body began to be reified, and it slid into a kind of devaluation of the female. Fractional complementarity expressed itself in various ways. Woman was thought to provide $\frac{1}{4}$ of the mind's operations, i.e. intuition, and man the other $\frac{3}{4}$; a ratio of $\frac{1}{3}$ with $\frac{2}{3}$, or some other fraction that when added up produces only one mind. In the hidden polarity, usually the lesser valued operation was identified with women and the greater valued operation with identified with man.

The next two to three hundred years produced several brilliant philosophers whose context flowed from the newly developed Reform Churches For example, Jean Jacques Rousseau, who shifted back and forth between Calvinist and Catholic

communions, described women's 'rationality' as focussing primarily on the emotions, on practical decisions in the present, and on the general categories of taste, sentiments, and the senses, while men's minds focussed on ideas and arguments, abstract judgments, and planning for the future. In *Emile* he argued that the union of man and woman produced just one moral person. Mary Wollstonecraft, an Anglican, bitterly attacked Rousseau's fractional complementarity in *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* saying that his theory means that a woman can not educate her own children when her husband was not there to lend her his reason, or when they add up to make only one moral being with a blind will, an eyes without hands.

Several other philosophers of the reform ended up ^{supporting} with a fractional complementarity with a hidden sex polarity. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), from a Pietist family background, identified women with sensation and taste and man with reason; Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860) stated that women's weaker reasoning makes them tied to the present and men to abstract ideas, and maxims grounded in the past and in the future. Frederick Hegel (1770-1831) argued that woman was tied to the particular and man to the universal. Soren Kierkegaard (1813-1855) located woman within the aesthetic and religious spheres of existence, while man had the full range including the ethical sphere. Nietzsche (1844-1900) was ambivalent when he said that women were superior by virtue of their Dionysian inheritance, but that they were locked into a slave morality. It seems as though traditional polarity had moved in through the back door of Cartesian dualism of mind and body. Specific male or female identified characteristics were very superficial, rather than based on the integral identity of whole human being as a man or as a woman.

5 what author for

With the rejection of a hylomorphic foundation for the human being, philosophers of the Cartesian heritage began the hunt for essential characteristics of a woman or a man that were abstract universals or stereotypes. In the Post Cartesian phase of western thought, significant differences between women and men shifted from a bodily origin of difference as in traditional polarity to a perceived particular mental difference. Fractional complementarity with its hidden polarity began to operate like traditional polarity theories which reduced the whole person to a particular element. Then this essential characteristic used to value one sex or gender over the other. A hylomorphically rooted theory of existential analogy needed to be articulated before a real integral gender complementarity could be articulated and defended.

Chronic Vigor of Living Idea of Human Being and Complementarity in Phenomenology and NeoThomism

In the late 19th century early 20th century vigorous renewal in the development of western philosophy began to occur both in the Reform and Catholic traditions. Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) *converted to and* was Baptized a Lutheran Christian in 1886. He went on to found the new field of phenomenology. Hedwig Conrad-Martius (1888-1966), a student of Husserl and scholar in phenomenology, *as well* converted with her husband to Lutheranism. She became a close friend of Edith Stein and Baptismal sponsor when Edith was received into the Catholic Church in 1922. Dietrich von Hildebrand (1889-1997) also studied in Husserl's phenomenological circles, and he became a Catholic in 1914. In this dynamic context of renewal, developments in the living ideas of a human being and of the complementarity of man and woman began to flow with great new philosophic energy.

Complementarity gets its name: Dietrich von Hildebrand

In 1922, Niels Bohr won the Nobel Prize in Physics. One year later in 1923 Dietrich von Hildebrand, gave a public lecture *On Marriage (Die Ehe)*. Four years after that, in 1927 Niels Bohr during in a lecture in Lake Como, Italy for the very first time introduced the word 'complementarity', to describe the 'wave-particle complementary theory' of light. Just two years later, in 1929 Dietrich von Hildebrand in his published version of the lecture on marriage, *Die Ehe* used the word 'complementarity' (Ergänzung) twice in direct reference to man and woman. He argued against the "terrible anti-personalism" of the age and insisted that marriage occurs between a man and a woman who are "metaphysically" complementary persons.

Dietrich Von Hildebrand continued to explore the nature of these complementary relations. His analysis included the first two central components, namely equality and significant differentiation. In addition, he began to explore and defend the third component, synergetic relations. He identified self-donating love as the dynamic synergetic aspect of man-woman complementarity. Von Hildebrand spent his life opening up the depth of complementarity in married love, and collaborated with his wife Alice von Hildebrand. In a 1966 book on *Man and Woman* he argued the dissimilarity of a woman and a man allowed for a deeper penetration into the soul of the other as a real complementary relationship.

Complementary Feminine and Masculine Psyches: Edith Stein

Even though she never used the 'word' complementarity, St. Edith Stein identified gender differentiated aspects of woman's and man's psyches. Edith Stein and

von Hildebrand had both been members of the Philosophical Society, composed of students studying under Husserl and Scheler in Göttingen from 1914. By 1930 Edith Stein wrote about her collaboration with von Hildebrand in giving lectures at a conference in Salzburg, Austria.

Using the phenomenological method Stein proposed essential characteristics of woman's singular identity even to the point of suggesting that there might be such a thing as a woman's soul distinct from a man's soul. While some of the characteristics she identified tend to seem stereotyped to the contemporary reader, Stein's description emphasized that women tend to focus on the whole person and seek to foster the harmony and growth of others to become complete human beings. This insight of Edith Stein will become the seed of John Paul II's later theory of the genius of woman.

After her conversion to Catholicism Stein's philosophy of woman and man turned to a renewed Thomistic metaphysics to definitively reject Cartesian dualism and its effects. She affirmed the unity of the soul/body composite, and argued that the human soul has priority in a woman's and man's identity. Edith Stein attended the Thomistic circle meetings that were held in Meudon, France in the home of Jacques and Raissa Maritain. Stein's work in the 1920's-1930's can be characterized as trying to unify the phenomenological approach to the human psyche through describing the human being as a unity of soul and body in the Aristotelian and Thomistic hylomorphic understanding.

(who had converted to Catholicism in 1906)

After entering a Carmelite monastery, now known as Sister Teresa Benedicta of the Cross, she wrote about describing the development of a human being in terms of *Potency and Act*. In her major book *Finite and Eternal Being*, published after her death, Sr. Benedicta identified four different meanings of form: essential form, individual form,

her name is Edeltraud

empty form, and pure form to overcome. She also followed Dietrich von Hildebrand in giving an extensive analysis of love as the mutual self-gift of persons. The recovery of form, as a key to the renewed metaphysical understanding of the human being as a form/matter or soul/body composite, began to occur in the writings of other significant Catholic philosophers.

Bernard Lonergan, SJ (1904-1984) immediately wrote a review for *The Canadian Register* (Quebec Edition) on May 23, 1942, of the first English translation in 1942 of Von Hildebrand's book On Marriage. Lonergan then quickly adopted the word 'complementary' to describe man-woman relations in his 1943 essay, "Finality, Love, Marriage." Equally significant is the fact that Lonergan loved and understood advancements in science. As a NeoThomist (and by incorporating the scientific evidence from the empirical observations of advanced microscopes from the 18th century on) he kept the fundamental metaphysical principle of hylomorphism, or the form/matter composite structure of a woman and a man in tact while expanding it to incorporate more accurate scientific truths. This structure will finally provide evidence of a true biological complementarity of woman and man in generation. It took over two-thousand years for the error in Aristotelian study of generation to be identified. Lonergan would call such a long period of blindness a universal bias. Today we would more likely refer to it as the traditional polarity 'sex ideology' of no-fertile-female-seed.

Lonergan distinguished three different hierarchally-arranged levels of relation of man and woman: the lowest is the spontaneous sexual level, the middle is the level of the male and female human being---of friendship, rational life, and virtue; and the highest level is the level of grace—in charity between husband and wife and participation in the

mystical communion of persons. Keeping in mind, that for Lonergan, beings with a central form and the higher levels of hierarchally organized conjugate forms organize the lower ones, complementarity at the lowest level is described as dividing sex into two complementary semifecundities including reference to chromosomes, the endocrinal glands, anatomical structure, physiological function. Lonergan identifies the complementary ways that male and female human beings provide genetic material for generation. He does not stop there, however, because of his understanding of the hierarchically structured order within a female human being and a male human being. The complementary semifecundities are then understood through the higher principles of organization within a woman and a man. They include the totality of vital, psychic, sensitive, emotional characters and consequently, though not formally, in the higher nonorganic activities of reason and rational appetite.

For Lonergan, sex identity is not just a matter of division, but also of union. Sexual activity is the principle of reunion of the divided semifecundities. It unites not only the semifecundities of spermatozoon and ovum but also their bearers: it makes male and female complementarity beings. Continuing his ordering of the lower by the higher set of forms, a man and woman united in marriage may enter the spiritual realms of friendship and grace.

By the time that Bernard Lonergan published his main philosophical work *Insight*, in 1957, he had adopted the notion of 'complementarity' to describe many different kinds of models of explanation. His theory of emergent probability explained how conjugate forms organized by a central form were in hierarchical levels within the human person which are studied moving from the sciences of physics, to chemistry, to biology, to

psychology, to philosophy, to theology. Lonergan's structure of thought demonstrates both Newman's fourth criteria of the logical sequence in fidelity in development of *hylomorphism* and of integral complementarity of woman and man; and Newman's seventh criteria of *chronic vigor of a true development of an idea* in distinction from its corruptions, perversions, and decays.

Other Catholic authors also brought a new vigor to discussions about form and *hylomorphism*. Msgr. Robert Sokolowski began to write about how the similarities and differences in the understanding of form and DNA; Hans Urs von Balthasar opened up an avenue of complementary vocations using the concept of different forms of life. In all this creative activity of Catholic philosophers the living ideas of *hylomorphism* and integral complementarity of woman and man were demonstrating the preservation of their original type, continuity of principles and logical sequence in fidelity in development

✓ Decay and Perversion of Human Person and Relation in Philosophers Turned Atheists

Recalling Newman's theory that the path of development of true living ideas is accompanied by conflict, it will not be surprising to consider two major streams of rejection of the two living ideas of the human being as a soul/body composite and of the relations of man and woman as a prime model for integral gender complementarity. The first stream will include reference to four major Catholic philosophers who publically renounced their faith and turned to systematic atheism. The following descriptions are drawn from the authors own words.

Jean Paul Sartre (1905-1980) described in his autobiography an event in his childhood when he was playing with matches he became enraged that God would be watching him, and he later decided that God simply did not exist. Sartre moved from this decision about the absence of God to a systematic atheism as the foundation for his existentialism. In *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre reinvented Cartesian categories, the for-itself which was pure consciousness ever projecting into the future, and the in-itself which was ^{body, and} dead static past. He argued that the human person kept trying to become his own self-cause, which turns out to be self-contradictory. He concluded that 'man is a useless passion.'

In addition, for John Paul Sartre relations with other persons, were primarily conflicted, intellectually with each person seeming to turn the other into an object, or resisting being turned into an object. He entered into multiple affairs with women and men, although saying that generally he was bored by them. He agreed with Simone de Beauvoir to allow one another multiple partners on the condition that they would share ^{all} the details of such encounters with one another, thus using or instrumentalizing others as fodder for their own relationships.

Simone de Beauvoir (1908-1985) described how, although brought up as a practicing Catholic, one day after participating in the Sacrament of Confession, she decided that God did not exist. Later in her life, she justified herself with respect to systematic atheism when she repeated Sartre's description that 'a being existing both in

the mode of the in-itself and in that of the for-itself was unthinkable.' She considered her youthful attitude about God as simple fables.

In *The Second Sex* Simone de Beauvoir's famous statement at one is not born, but rather becomes a woman, is couched in a paragraph that describes the woman as socially constructed by the other, or society. While there is a truth that a person actualizes the self by choices and actions either as a particular kind of woman or man, the socially constructed model is false as a general description. deBeauvoir also despised her female body, as imprisoning her though her ovaries and uterus. The passive in-itself nature, like in Descartes, is rejected for an isolated 'thinking mind.'

In spite of great fame for their intellectual gifts and achievements and much political activity in Marxist and Feminist areas, the tragedy of Sartre and deBeauvoir's lives is most acutely described in her text *Adieux Sartre*, which recounts their final years. In the end, both deadened their minds with alcohol and drugs, and following Sartre's death deBeauvoir reflected with surety that it was just how things are that Sartre's death separated them, and her death will never bring them together again.

Michel Foucault (1926-1984), did not directly ~~renounce~~ ^{or describe} a moment when he rejected his faith., but he used religious words in many unusual ways. Foucault introduced in *The Order of Things* an image of the human face exploding in laughter at the self. ~~He recalled~~ ^{is who} Recalling Nietzsche man explodes in laughter at the 'return of the same with the absolute dispersion of man'. The theme of ridiculing and self-destructive laughter is developed further by Foucault five years later (1971) in "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History"

where he describes man learning how to laugh at the solemnities of the origin, thinking he was created by a Creator.

Foucault also argued that the human being was a recent invention, one that was likely coming to its end. He invoked a vivid image that human beings could simply be caused to crumble and then they would be erased 'like a face drawn in sand at the edge of the sea.' The deconstruction of the human being, man or woman was on the way full time. In Foucault's introduction to a study of the life of the hermaphrodite, *Herculine Barbin*, Foucault asked whether it was necessary for society even to have a 'true sex' when all that really mattered was in his words 'the reality of the body and the intensity of its pleasures.'

Foucault seemed to recognize that an absent metaphysical foundation inevitably leads to emptiness. He argued that he was in a time of the end of metaphysics, and that all metaphysical impulses are actually veils of illusion. Michel Foucault shifted his personal focus to bodies and ultimately to units of pleasure. Fascinated by the materiality of bodies, their forces, energies, sensations and pleasures Foucault ended his life already dying from aids, but still seeking the ultimate pleasure in sadomasochistic encounters in San Francisco.

Mary Daly (1928-2010), the fourth and final example of significant authors who rejected their Catholic faith, was educated from beginning to end in Catholic Institutions. She wrote her two doctoral dissertations in Fribourg, Switzerland on the works of Thomas Aquinas (Theology) and Jacques Maritain (Philosophy), respectively. She was caught up in early feminism and at first a theory of androgyny, but later radical feminism.

By 1970 Mary Daly began consulting a spiritual medium. In the Fall of 1971, Daly organized at the Harvard University Chapel a walk-out from patriarchal religion laughing at hearing the hymn to the Holy Spirit. One year later, at Harvard University where she was delivering the prestigious Lenz Lecture, Daly directly attacked the Christian Trinity. From that point on Daly's life shifted toward being totally 'woman-identified' including lesbian relations, ^{wicca} and in direct opposition to men, calling sexism the original sin, and all men tainted by their identity with any and all effects of patriarchy.

To conclude this brief section, even though Sartre, de Beauvoir, Foucault, and Daly had all been baptized a common thread among them was their increasingly shrill attack on Christianity, and on Catholicism, and the deconstruction of the human person of complementary relations among women and men. Into this context of progressive attacks on fundamental truths of Christianity, Cardinal Newman's reflections, while he was writing about the heresies in early Christianity, seem to relate very well to this more contemporary phenomena: 'In one point alone the heresies seem universally to have agreed, --- in hatred to the Church. This might at that time be considered one of her surest and most obvious Notes. She was that body of which all sects, however, divided among themselves, spoke ill...'

Decay and Perversion of Human Person and Relation in Gender Ideology

In 1620 England a satire called *Hic Mulier* combined a play on linguistic gender and human gender identity when the author described women as masculine in their genders and added that whole generations of women were most masculine and most

monstrous. The author used the characteristic of clothes worn by men or women as ^{key} essential to each gender's identity and the humor of the satire came from the switching of the clothes to the other gender. Two centuries before this popular satire Joan of Arc was put to death in 1431 for wearing men's clothes during her trial in France, even though she did that to protect herself from sexual harassment. In 1943 C.S. Lewis, also in the Anglican tradition, drew upon Neoplatonic sources, to make the argument in his science fiction work *Perelandra* that 'gender is a more fundamental reality than sex,' and that male and female living creatures are derived (blurred) figures of a cosmic masculine and feminine. Gender seemed to float like an mental ideal above the living reality of actual women and men.

These examples flow from the second Cartesian & head.

The second stream flowing from a rejection of the two living ideas of the human being as a soul/body composite and of the relations of man and woman as a prime model for integral gender complementarity followed the pathway of the Protestant Reform traditions and particularly from England and other English speaking countries. One gateway to this stream was the physician philosopher John Locke (1632-1704), who described substantial forms as "gibberish" and who made a fatal division between a man, whose identity is measured by the dimensions and continuity of his body, and a person whose identity is measured by the continuity of consciousness alone. The radical separation of consciousness, or the person from man, and the body created an environment in which increasingly superficial criteria were applied to the respective identities of women and men.

John Locke is ^{also} credited with beginning the social science of modern psychology. Many other social sciences followed from this starting point.

In 1949, **Margaret Mead**, an anthropologist coming from Episcopal religious family, concluded after her anthropological field studies in Somoa and New Zealand that sex-roles were simply culturally learned and that masculine or feminine characteristics were artificially assigned. She even asked the question of what a language would be like that had thirteen 'genders'. Her work *Male and Female: A Study of the Sexes in a Changing World* and her conclusion that sex roles are arbitrarily assigned to men and women in different cultures opened the door, perhaps unknowingly, to a mutation of gender ideology to begin.

Dr. John Money, who was born into an evangelical Brethren family in New Zealand, likely learned of Mead's research during his undergraduate studies. He came to the United States to obtain a doctorate in Psychology from Harvard University basing his research on a study of hermaphrodites. At Harvard, Money likely learned about Alfred Kinsey's research on human sexual behavior. Kinsey, who came from a family with a Methodist religious background drew some of his theories as an entomologist from the study of insects and other animals and applied them to human sexuality. Both Money and Kinsey will erroneously make direct arguments from the sexual behavior of animals to what should be normal for human beings, forgetting that the soul of a human being also operates as a spirit and is not reducible to just a form organizing matter. Similarly, both Money and Foucault will make erroneous arguments from a study of the exception of hermaphrodites to normal human beings.

After Dr. Money graduated from Harvard, he was hired by Johns Hopkins University, and in 1955, in the first published paper from Johns Hopkins on this research project, Dr. Money argued directly from the study of hermaphrodites to a conclusion

about normal males and females, namely that gender identity is environmentally ^{completed} caused during the approximately two years of life. Money later called this time frame of approximately two years from birth to the settling of one's sexual and gender identity a gender gate or gender window.

Twenty years after his original studies, in a text published in 1975, *Sexual Signatures: On Being a Man or a Woman*: Dr. Money continued to argue ^{fallaciously} from the exception to the rule: He asked: 'But is the gate also open for those who were sexually normal at birth? Transsexuals give the answer—yes.' Dr. John Money's method of arguing from the exception (hermaphrodites) to the rule (either male or female) is the first error of reasoning that we encounter in his work

To offer a 'so called proof with a control' for his thesis, Dr. Money collaborated with surgeons to operate on one of a pair of identical twin boys, one who had suffered an accident during circumcision. He convinced the parents to bring this boy up as a girl, never speaking the truth about what had happened. After several years of failing in his experiment, Dr. Money never admitted publically to his fraud. Instead he published, through the Johns Hopkins Press, *Man and Woman Boy and Girl: The Differentiation and Dimorphism of Gender Identity from Conception to Maturity*. In this book, he proclaimed the 'great success of his twins experiment'. Sprinkled through the book Money states proudly, after describing his successes in gender identity-differentiation among human hermaphrodites, "A similar extraordinary contrast has been observed even which a child born as a normal male was surgically reassigned as a female...[I]n gender behavior, she is quite gender-different from her identical twin brother."

Money's argument is flawed, because he never really proved that gender is environmentally caused. He just showed that he could make a child born as a male become a female by surgery and hormones.

6/25/2020
 This new book of Money's was praised on its cover by The New York Times:

"The Brilliant New Landmark study of human sexuality... The most important work since the Kinsey Reports"; Time Magazine soon followed. The conclusion most often repeated was that sex and gender identity was more due to environmental factors than to genes, anatomy, hormones and other natural factors from conception, birth, and puberty. Money himself continued to mention in all his speeches the great success of his theory of the gender gate or gender window. Dr. John Money never corrected his public position about the gender window or gender gate which he continued to promote and to allow others to promote. He never even averted to the failure of his 'twins experiment.'

We see here the way in which an ideology separates itself from a reality; it ignores or repeatedly denies contrary facts. An ideology also often harms the innocent. This beginning of gender ideology tragically eventually led to the suicides of both of the twin brothers, and to hospitalization for mental illness and struggle with alcoholism for their parents. The Johns Hopkins Gender Identity Clinic was shut down, but others opened up to serve the adult transgendered population who wanted to surgically and medically change their bodies to conform to their minds.

In reviewing the publications of Dr. John Money other important philosophical errors become evident. He first introduced a strict division between 'Gender Identity' as private and 'Gender Role' as public and then tried to bring them together in the phrase 'gender identity/role.' Dr Money also described 'the sexuality of the individual [as] a cumulative composite of [six] separate sexes.' The six separate sexes were called: Chromosomal sex, Gonadal Sex, Physiological sex, Morphological sex, Behavioral sex, and Psychological sex (gender-role/identity). We can see in these errors the echo of

These seven were reduced, made into things - or parts / parts of the whole instead of various aspects of a whole being

Descartes, who had a difficulty to being an integration back after he divided mind and body, and self and other.

The final problematic area in his work is his proactive promotion of eroticism among adults and children. Drawing analogies from monkeys ^{at University} and other Wisconsin Regional Primate Center where juvenile rhesus monkeys have been studied Money concluded that pornography should be introduced into the home and school as regular sex education of children. He went far and wide to promote his pornographic material always posing as ^{a scientist} science and social science ^{not} evidence. ^{eroticophilia,}

Feminisms Adopt the Word 'Gender' and Gender goes 'viral'

The first set of willing hosts for gender ideology in the 1970's were feminists. **Kate Millett (1934-)** in chapter two of her book *Sexual Politics* introduced the term 'gender'. She referred to its use by Dr. Robert Stoller who, following Dr. John Money, discussed the path to establishing a core gender identity by the age of eighteen months. Kate Millet then emphasizes the radical fluidity of gender identity when she concludes that gender is so arbitrary that it may even be contrary to physiology. Kate Millett then drew conclusions from her own feminist evaluation of socially conditioned engendered stereotypes like passivity. Millett continued to analyze what she identifies as the evils of patriarchy in political, polemical, and literary works and events. She became one of the founding members of NOW, the Secular National Organization of Women.

Dr. Alice Rossi who was a founding member of NOW in 1966 transmitted a portion of Dr. Money's gender ideology throughout the field of sociology. She taught at Johns Hopkins and participated in a conference with him. In the proceedings of the 1971

conference, Dr. Rossi cited John Money's research on gender six separate times in references to her Chapter on "Maternalism, Sexuality, and the New Feminism."

Alice Rossi's seminal work, *The Feminist Papers: From Adams to de Beauvoir*, was published in 1973, when many universities were beginning courses in women's studies and feminist studies. Her anthology included a selection of readings both on and by Margaret Sanger on *Birth Control*; and another selection on and from Margaret Mead: *Sex and Temperament*. Through this pathway, Rossi's respect for Money's research and her feminist defense for abortion and birth-control spread throughout the United States and other English-speaking countries.

Gayle Rubin (1949-), after completing her MA in Anthropology at the University of Michigan, introduced the phrase '*sex/gender system*' in her 1975 article "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." Following a Marxist approach, she defined the phrase: I "... call that part of social life the '*sex/gender system*' [which] is the set of arrangements by which a society transforms biological sexuality into products of human activity, and in which these transformed sexual needs are satisfied." Arguing that men traffic in women to satisfy their sexual needs, Rubin concluded that '*Gender is just a socially imposed division of the sexes*'. Her solution to the so-called division of sexes is to political action to reorganize the *sex/gender system* towards the elimination of obligatory sexualities and sex roles. She promoted androgynous and genderless (though not sexless) society, in which one's sexual anatomy is irrelevant to one and all. By 1978 Rubin turned her own life and research towards sado-maschism in a study of and living with gay men and lesbian women in San Francisco, completing her

PhD in Anthropology for the University of Michigan with a dissertation titled: The Valley of the Kings: Leathermen in San Francisco 1960-1990.

Philosophically speaking, there is an incoherence in the initial sex/gender system structure, which attempted to divide these two realities, making sex an aspect of the body and gender of social cultural characteristics. Then the structure will collapse in on itself as gender eventually becomes redefined with direct reference to many different kinds of sexual activities and identities. *

The next phase of the word 'gender' going viral came through the integration into many text books Dr. Money's theory of the fluidity of one's gender identity from birth to the age of two. The next step in the viral transmission of gender ideology, many other feminists offered academic lectures, became directly involved in political action, and produced numerous text books incorporating Money's descriptions about gender identity/role. These willing hosts spread gender ideology through out universities across America, Canada, England, Australia, and the English-speaking world.

An example of such a textbook is *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach* which was published in 1978 in the four countries of England, Australia, Canada, and the United States. In the preface its two authors Suzanne Kessler and Wendy McKenna state that their theoretical position is that gender is a social construction and reduces gender identity to a simple feeling. Another example of a popular textbook, *The Question of Sex Differences: Psychological, Cultural, and Biological Issues* was published in the US and Canada the following year, 1979, authored by Katharine Hoyenga and Kermit Hoyenga. Even though the title emphasizes Sex, the content completely adopts Money's use of terms and definitions.

→ go to page 50

Fidelity of Development and Anticipation of Future for Gender Reality in Personalism and Integral Gender Complementarity

In 1932 Emmanuel Mounier (1905-1950) and Jacques Maritain founded in Paris a personalist review *Esprit*. By 1934 Mounier and Maritain were meeting regularly with Gabriel Marcel and Nicholae Berdjaev in a philosophy discussion group. Together they published a "Personalist Manifesto," a public articulation of a new Catholic personalism in the face of distortions of the human person by communism, capitalism, and various European and North American political movements.

In the broad sense, French personalism took up the notion of person, implicitly identified in Thomistic theology, and opened up its social and political dimensions for human persons. In this way the movement exemplifies the fifth criteria for a true and living idea according to Newman: namely the anticipation of its future in favor of developments, ethical or political. In Newman's words:

It has been set down above as a fifth argument in favor of the fidelity of developments, ethical or political, if the doctrine from which they have proceeded has, in any early stage of its history, given indications of those opinions and practices in which it has ended.

In 1936 Mounier published in *Esprit* the first article on the relation between personalism and woman's identity, entitled "La femme aussi est une personne." (Woman is also a Person). This principle that women and men are equally persons began to provide a more solid foundation for the principle of equal dignity and worth for the integral complementarity of woman and man.

Gabriel Marcel (1889-1973) a key figure in the French Personalist study group, converted from agnosticism to Catholicism in 1929. Marcel focused on the need for an open ego for persons in relation and for a creative fidelity in living a body of love and

life-long commitment to another person. In his essay "Phenomenological notes on being in a situation" Marcel elaborated on this core attitude: "I must somehow make room for the other in myself.... We are concerned exclusively with the experience which is expressed by the words *being at home*... To receive is to admit someone from the outside into one's own home.... to receive in this context is to open myself to, hence to give myself, rather than to undergo an external action ." This reality of self-gift to another is an act of availability. This is the love that is at the heart of being in a family.

Marcel then observes that even though a husband and wife do not belong to one another like a possession; a person can give himself or herself to another as an act, almost saying 'I belong to you because I freely give myself to you.' This can be done in a spousal gift of love and in a religious act of giving oneself to God. In his "Phenomenological Notes on Being in a Situation," he summarizes it this way: "I should like to point out ... the curious incongruity... between the statement *I belong to you* and its counterpart or rejoinder: *you belong to me*. The latter implies a claim, the former a commitment." Gabriel and Jacqueline Marcel were plunged into the deep mystery of the overflowing of love from their marriage into the development of a family, when in 1922 they chose to adopt a six-year old boy:

We had been told that he was a timid child, who would perhaps not let himself be known too easily. How moved we were in seeing him run towards us and throw himself into our arms, as though he had truly been waiting for us. This was a moment of grace which I still keenly feel today. Here adoption took on its full meaning. Were we the ones who were choosing? Were we not rather chosen? (A, 114)

Twenty years later Marcel was invited to teach a course on Fatherhood at Lyons. His journals during his preparation are full of excitement and long thought-out insights into the meaning of fatherhood. "First notes for a course on fatherhood which was requested

for Lyons. Fatherhood as Heading—Fatherhood as a value of exaltation: “I am a father!”...Pride...; it is impossible to reduce fatherhood to a biological category, and yet it belongs to the flesh. Adoption is a grafting.”¹

Creative fidelity is the form of the commitment of marriage between a husband and wife, and it is the form of commitment of paternity between father and child. In an essay which unfolds the metaphysical structure and dynamics of “Creative Fidelity”

Marcel asks how is a person able to make a commitment to another person that extends beyond the moment:

What does it really mean to swear fidelity? and how can such a promise be made? The question cannot be asked without giving rise to an antinomy. The promise in fact is made on the basis of some present inner disposition. However: Can I affirm that the disposition, which I have just at the moment that I commit myself, will not alter later on?²

The Polish Development of Complementarity: MA Krapiec and Karol Wojtyla's Lublin Existential Thomist Personalism

In 1934 Emmanuel Mounier published an article in a Polish review (*Wiadomosci Literackie*) describing the personalist movement in France. *The Personalist Manifesto* was translated into Polish and distributed underground in Poland during World War II. After the war, in May 1946, Mounier was invited to lecture at Cracow Jagellonian University while Karol Wojtyla was a new seminarian studying there. It is not surprising then that in the summer of 1947, Wojtyla, who was studying in Rome and living at the Belgian College, decided to go to France to study the worker-priest movement. John Paul II tells us directly in *Gift and Mystery* that “My formation within the cultural horizon of

¹ Gabriel Marcel, *Metaphysical Journal* 1943, in *Presence and Immortality* (Pittsburgh, Pa., Duquesne University Press, 1967), 91. [Originally published 1937-1943].

² Marcel, *Creative Fidelity*, 158.

personalism also gave me a deeper awareness of how each individual is a unique person."³

A second connection to a Polish philosophy of woman came through the phenomenologist Roman Ingarden (1893-1970) and his intimate intellectual friendship with Edith Stein. They were graduate students together under Husserl and Ingarden became a mentor of the young Karol Wojtyla in Cracow. Alasdair MacIntyre, in *Edith Stein: A Philosophical Prologue, 1913-1922*, often refers to the relation between the two intellectual friends. For example, between 1913-1916, "On her visit to Heidelberg, ...she also deepened her friendship with Roman Ingarden ...[who] was two years younger than Stein;" and from 1916-1922 after the war, "Roman Ingarden, on whom Stein had relied heavily for intellectual support— returned to a newly independent Poland."⁴

Ingarden described his relation with Stein as follows:

...we conversed together every day [1916-1917] on many subjects, but especially on various details of her personal activities as an assistant [to Husserl].... When eventually I went for several months to my own country, a lively correspondence took place between us. [When] I came back to Freiburg [1917-1918]...[h]ardly a day passed during that period in which we did not meet and talk together. Having passed my doctor's degree examination I returned to Cracow, and from that time till the outbreak of war in 1939 we met only twice; ...but during the whole of that period we continually wrote letters to each other. After the end of the war I was told that she had been killed.⁵

In a letter written in 1940 from the Carmel in Echt, Holland, Sister Benedicta asked if there were any information during the war about "Ingarden and his four sons?"⁶

³ John Paul II, *Gift and Mystery: On the Fiftieth Anniversary of My Priestly Ordination* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 94.

⁴ Alasdair MacIntyre, *A Philosophical Prologue, 1913-1922* (Lanham/Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006), 74 and 90.

⁵ Roman Ingarden, "Edith Stein On Her Activity as an Assistant of Edmund Husserl: Extracts from the Letters of Edith Stein with a Commentary and Introductory Remarks," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, vol. 23, no.2 (December 1962): 155-75. Bold my emphasis.

⁶ Stein, *Self-Portrait in Letters*, #315, 326.

→ Roman Ingarden ended up in Crakow, where **Karol Wojtyla** made his acquaintance and likely learned much about Edith Stein's philosophy through him. Later, as John Paul II, he reflected back on his years as Cardinal Archbishop of Krakow: "In Kraków I also tried to maintain a good rapport with the philosophers: Roman Ingarden.... My personal philosophical outlook moves, so to speak, between two poles: Aristotelian Thomism and phenomenology. I was particularly interested in Edith Stein, an extraordinary figure, for her life story as well as her philosophy."⁷

In my view, it is likely that the formal elements of Edith Stein's concept of woman were transmitted through her graduate student friend Roman Ingarden to Karol Wojtyla, who then read her works and adopted central aspects of their form while rejecting core components of some of the contents in elaborating his own personalist concept of woman. One particular point of disagreement is found in that Wojtyla/John Paul II never accepted Stein's view that a woman could have masculine characteristics or a man feminine characteristics. Instead, he consistently maintained that masculine means the way that a man acts in the world and feminine means the way a woman acts in the world.⁸

In 1954 Karol Wojtyla was hired by M.A. Krapiec, OP Professor of Metaphysics and Dean of Philosophy, to teach Ethics at the Catholic University of Lublin, a post he held for 22 years, travelling overnight Sunday to teach all day Mondays, even when he was Archbishop of Cracow. As described in the Second Cardinal Stafford Lecture,

→ Krapiec had provided a new Thomistic metaphysical foundation for existential analogies, a principle that Wojtyla assumed in his developed personalist philosophy. Elaborating on

⁷ John Paul II, *Rise, Let us be On Our Way* (New York: Warner Books, 2004), 90.

⁸ My own position has grown steadily towards that of Karol Wojtyla/ John Paul II, as will be argued in a later chapter in this book.

this theme of existential analogy it is possible to demonstrate that man and woman are the prime analogates, from which all other forms of interpersonal existential analogies are derived. A similar point is made by George Weigel:

Personalism was thus the ground on which John Paul could insist that "Christianity is not an opinion" or a set of propositions, but rather, "Christianity is Christ! It is a Person."... As for the Church itself, it was a privileged embodiment in history of the *communio personarum*, the communion of persons, that is both a longing of the human heart and a sign of the interior life of God the Holy Trinity.⁹

Lublin existential personalism demonstrated a chronic vigor for the true development of the idea of complementarity of woman and man from its corruptions and perversions. In 1960 the young priest, Karol Wojtyla published his first major work on ethics in marriage entitled, *Love and Responsibility*. Already new roots for man-woman integral complementarity were being put down. Marriage is describe as having a "distinctive inter-personal structure," with laws "derived from the principles of the personalistic norm, for only in this way can the genuinely personal character of a union of two persons be ensured."¹⁰ The personalistic norm claims that one should always treat another person as an end in the self, and never only as a means.

In *Love and Responsibility* Wojtyla also considers what will become a biological foundation for woman's unique approach to another person, namely that by a woman's ovulation from puberty to menopause she has a monthly rhythm that disposes her to welcome new life, even if she never becomes pregnant: Woman's lived experience of ovulation from puberty to menopause is "the origin of the maternal instinct" or natural

⁹ George Weigel, *The End and the Beginning: Pope John Paul II—The Victory of Freedom, the Last Years, the Legacy* (New York: Doubleday, 2010.), 473.

¹⁰ Karol Wojtyla, *Love and Responsibility* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993), 218-19.

orientation of woman toward another human being.¹¹ Man has a different biological foundation for his unique identity as a father. It is important to note that for Wojtyla, nature does not determine identity, which must also include acts of will and intelligence. He identifies a challenge for man, to overcome all utilitarian propensities to use a woman for her sensual value to him, and alternately the challenge for woman to overcome all utilitarian propensities to use a man for his sentimental value to her¹²

Integration, a key element in integral gender complementarity, is introduced: love “aims not only at integration ‘within’ the person but at integration ‘between’ persons; ... ‘integration’ means ‘making whole,’ ... [and it] relies on the primary elements of the human spirit — freedom and truth.”¹³ (116).” In 1969, Wojtyla provided a metaphysical foundation for integration in *The Acting Person*, by retrieving the *hylomorphism* of Thomas Aquinas. He stated his intention to “rethink anew the dynamic human reality” this medieval theory contained.¹⁴ Wojtyla argued that “integration complements transcendence and ... they thus form a dynamic ‘person-action-whole’, and that without integration transcendence (i.e., going forth into the world and forming the self by personal acts) remains... suspended...”¹⁵

With the beginnings of a personalist structure of human relations established, in 1974-1975 Wojtyla presented a theological framework for a genuine communion of persons in two lectures: “The Family as a Community of Persons” and “Parenthood as a

¹¹ Wojtyla, *Love and Responsibility*, 280.

¹² Wojtyla, *Love and Responsibility*, 104-14.

¹³ Karol Wojtyla, *The Acting Person* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1969), 116.

¹⁴ Wojtyla, *The Acting Person*, 203.

¹⁵ Wojtyla, *The Acting Person*, 190.

Communion of Persons.”¹⁶ He joined the mystery of human communities called to grow in likeness of the Divine Communion of Persons, with an integration of the biological and personal dynamics of man and woman in marriage and in the family. He also wrote a draft of a series of audiences on Genesis complete with sub-headings, which he then gave publically after he was elected Pope on October 16, 1978.¹⁷

Integral Complementarity for the Universal Church— Pope John Paul II 1979-1995

By way of introduction to the teachings of the universal Church about women's and men's respective identities, within the year of being elected on October 16, 1978 Pope John Paul II (previously Karol Cardinal Wojtyla) gave a series of Audiences in which he analyzed man-woman complementarity, as revealed in *Genesis*. In his words:

... in the light of this text we understand that the knowledge of man passes through masculinity and femininity, which are, as it were two “incarnations” of the same metaphysical solitude before God and the world—two reciprocally completing ways of “being a body” and at the same time of being human---as two complementary dimensions of self-knowledge and self-determination and, at the same time, two complementarity ways of being conscious of the meaning of the body.¹⁸

Asserting that God created man and woman equal as human beings and equal as persons, he defended the first principle of integral complementarity. Stating that man and woman are two significantly different ways of being persons in the world, he defended the second principle of integral complementarity. Demonstrating how a man and a woman

¹⁶ Karol Wojtyla, “The Family as a Community of Persons,” and “Parenthood as a Community of Persons,” in *Person and Community: Selected Essays* (San Francisco: Peter Lang, 1993), chapters 21-22, 315-42.

¹⁷ For a detailed discussion of the original drafts and final translations see Michael Waldstein, introduction to John Paul II: *Man and Woman He Created Them: A Theology of the Body*, trans. Michael Waldstein (Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 2006), 1-22.

¹⁸ John Paul II, *Man and Woman He Created Them A Theology of the Body*, General Audience of November 21, 1979, 166.

are called by God into a union of love in marriage, he proclaimed the vocational dimension of integral complementarity.¹⁹

In his 1988 Apostolic Letter On the Dignity and Vocation of Women and his 1989 Apostolic Exhortation on St. Joseph, Guardian of the Redeemer, John Paul II began to elaborate foundational principles for three kinds of integral complementarity: 1) wife and husband in marriage, 2) mother and father in family, and 3) men's and women's vocations to human and spiritual parenthood. His elaborations affirmed principles directly counter to those prevalent in traditional polarity and unisex theories of man-woman relation in marriage, family, and vocations.

While many have argued in the past that Genesis suggests a subordination or inequality of woman in relation to man, John Paul II emphasizes the fundamental equality and dignity of woman and man. Having already prepared the ground-work for this claim in his Wednesday audiences of 1979-81,²⁰ in section #6 of *Mulieris Dignitatem*, he states unequivocally and with emphasis in italics: “[B]oth man and woman are human beings to an equal degree, both are created in God's image,” and “Man is a person, man and woman equally so, since both were created in the image and likeness of God.” Then to be sure that his reader gets the point, he adds: “The biblical text provides sufficient bases for recognizing the essential equality of man and woman from the point of view of their humanity. From the very beginning, both are persons, unlike the other living beings in the

¹⁹ John Paul II, *Original Unity of Man and Woman: Catechesis on the Book of Genesis* (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1981), (October 24, November 14, 21, and December 12, 1979), 61-91.

²⁰ For these detailed studies, see John Paul II, *Original Unity of Man and Woman: Catechesis on the Book of Genesis* (Boston: Daughters of St. Paul, 1981); John Paul II, *The Theology of the Body: Human Love in the Divine Plan* (Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 1997); and Mary Shivanandan, *Crossing the Threshold of Love: Contemporary Marriage in the Light of John Paul II's Anthropology* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1999).

world about them. The woman is another 'I' in a common humanity. By these repeated statements about women and men as human beings, as persons, as sharing a common humanity, Pope John Paul II has defended the first premise of what I call an "integral gender complementarity," namely the fundamental equality of dignity and worth of the two complement beings.

The second premise for integral gender complementarity is the identification of the significant differentiation of woman and man. The third premise for integral gender complementarity is the synergetic effects of their union in interpersonal relation. In section #7 the remaining two premises are clearly stated. Consider the following passage:

To be human means to be called to interpersonal communion. The text of Genesis 2: 18-25 shows that marriage is the first and, in a sense, the fundamental dimension of this call. But it is not the only one. The whole of human history unfolds within the context of this call. In this history, on the basis of the principle of mutually being "for" the other, in interpersonal "communion," there develops within humanity itself, in accordance with God's will, the integration of what is "masculine" and what is "feminine."

Here we discover the introduction of the significant differentiation between what is masculine and what is feminine, at the same time as we see a "call" to interpersonal communion. Further, marriage is the first and most fundamental dimension of this call, but not the only dimension. The Pope has not yet specified the essential characteristics that distinguish the masculine from feminine, but he has introduced them as significant at the same time as he states that interpersonal communion is called for in persons who are associated with what is masculine and what is feminine.

Next, John Paul II describes how this interpersonal communion is analogous to the communion among the Divine Persons in the Holy Trinity: "This 'unity of the two,' which is a sign of interpersonal communion, shows that the creation of man is also

marked by a certain likeness to the divine communion (*'communio'*). This likeness is a quality of the personal being of both man and woman, and is also a call and a task" (#7).

John Paul II appears to be making a distinction between the image of God which is found in each individual man and woman, created with an intellect and will, and the likeness of God which is more clearly seen in a communion of human persons called to become a living sign of the communio among Divine Persons

We have here an indication of two further directions that John Paul II will develop in his famous paragraph #99 of the 1995 Encyclical *On the Gospel of Life*. He begins with the following:

In transforming culture so that it supports life, women occupy a place, in thought and action, which is unique and decisive. It depends on them to promote a 'new feminism' which rejects the temptation of imitating models of 'male domination,' in order to acknowledge and affirm the true genius of women in every aspect of the life of society, and overcome all discrimination, violence, and exploitation.²¹

The Pope was attempting to protect the genuine uniqueness of woman's identity (what he calls her "own feminine 'originality'"). He warns her of the danger of assuming a particular characteristic of man's identity, namely the tendency towards domination of another person. Following this line of thought, Mary Ann Glendon, in her essay on "What Happened at Beijing" addressed the tendency of first world women who sought to impose their positions about contraception, abortion, and women's reproduction on third world women as a kind of new colonialism.²²

At the same time, as these new directions are opened up for our reflection, John Paul II specified that both recognizing specified inheritances of original sin and acting to purify them is part of our universal call to holiness: "The inheritance of sin suggested by

²¹ John Paul II, Encyclical *Evangelium Vitae* (*On the Gospel of Life*) (1995), #99. My emphasis.

²² Mary Ann Glendon, "What Happened at Beijing," in *Traditions in Turmoil* (Ann Arbor, Mi.: Sapientia Press, 2006), 105-13.

the words of the Bible—“Your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you”—*can be conquered only* by following this path. The overcoming of this evil inheritance is, generation after generation, the task of every human being, whether woman or man.”²³

It should be noted again that John Paul II never suggested that a man has a feminine side or a woman a masculine side of their identity. Instead John Paul elaborates different ways a woman discovers and fulfils her femininity in motherhood, and a man discovers and fulfils his masculinity in fatherhood. Continuing to build on his earlier philosophical foundations, he states that “motherhood implies from the beginning a special openness to the new person: and this is precisely the woman’s ‘part’ (#18).” Yet, this aspect of motherhood is not a biological determinism, because “motherhood is linked to the personal structure of the woman and to the personal dimension of the gift (#18).”

The next augmentation of John Paul II’s man-woman integral complementarity occurred in 1995 in the context of the Beijing United Nations Fourth World Meeting on Women. In his *Letter to Women* the significant difference between men and women is identified by Pope John Paul as *ontological*, rooted in their very being as a human persons: “womanhood and manhood are complementarity not only from the physical and psychological points of view, but also from the *ontological*.”²⁴ Integral complementarity is emphasized as again standing against traditional polarity, fractional complementarity, and unisex positions.

²³ The text continues directly focusing on man: “For whenever man is responsible for offending a woman’s personal dignity and vocation, he acts contrary to his own personal dignity and his own vocation.”, #10.

²⁴ John Paul II, *Letter to Women*., 52, #7.

The *Holy See's Position Paper for Beijing* proposes four integrated categories through which the ontological complementarity of men and women can be analyzed:

"Women and men are the illustration of a *biological, individual, personal and spiritual complementarity*."²⁵ This complementarity is always not as fractional parts of a man and a woman who in relation make up only a 'single human being.' but rather, of a man and woman as two concrete and integrated human persons in synergetic relations of mutual self-gift.

Counter Arguments and Responses to Integral Gender Complementarity

Once complementarity of woman and man became stabilized in Catholic thought, a new development occurred. Other groups began to draw upon the positive connotation of the word, at the same time as they defined it differently. In this context we see the need to reflect on Newman's sixth criteria for the true development of an idea: "A

Conservative action on its past (of its original) with corruption tending to its destruction."

Again Newman's words explain:

It is the general pretext of heretics that they are but serving and protecting Christianity by their innovations; and it is their charge against what by this time we may surely call the Catholic Church, that her successive definitions of doctrine have but overlaid and obscured it. That is, they assume, what we have no wish to deny, that a true development is that which is conservative of its original, and a corruption is that which tends to its destruction.²⁶

To conclude this section we will consider briefly three such developments.

²⁵ John Paul II, *Holy See's Position Paper for Beijing* (August 25, 1995) 1.1. Available from www.priestsforlife.org/magisterium/navarrobeijing08-25-95.htm See also Sr. Prudence Allen, "Integral Sex Complementarity and the Theology of Communion" *Communio* 17 (winter 1990): 523-544.

²⁶ Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, 419.

Egalitarian Complementarity

Confusing to Catholics may be the writings of ^{Evangelical} Protestant Christians who promote an 'egalitarian complementarity' which sprang up within partly as a result of secular feminist influences. Ronald W. Pierce and Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, eds, of *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity Without Hierarchy* elaborate this position.²⁷ They promote a unisex view of vocations within the Church contrary Pope John Paul II's articulation of the complementary of vocations called in service of self-gift to one another in likeness to the Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity. Equal dignity becomes transformed into identical roles, because there is no significant differentiation between men and women. A *hylomorphic* understanding of the human being provides Catholics with a metaphysical foundation to defend complementary vocations without sliding into a unisex model of gender relation.

Hierarchical Complementarity

Other ^{Evangelical} Protestant Christians promote a 'hierarchical complementarity.' See "The Danvers Statement" of 1987, and John Piper and Wayne Grudem, *What's the Difference? Manhood and Womanhood Defined According to the Bible* (1990); *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (1991); *50 Crucial Questions about Manhood and Womanhood* (1992); and *Can our*

²⁷ See Kevin Giles, *The Trinity and Subordinationism: The Doctrine of God and the Contemporary Gender Debate* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2002) and Ronald W. Pierce and Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, eds, *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity Without Hierarchy* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2004).

Differences be Settled? A Detailed Response to the Evangelical Feminist Position

Statement of Christians for Biblical Equality (1992).²⁸

This position of absolute male headship in marriage can be responded to by Pope John Paul II's careful explication in *Mulieris Dignitatem* (#24) of the meaning of mutual submission of husband and wife out of love of Christ. In his words: "both man and woman are human beings to an equal degree;" and "man is a person, man and woman equally so."²⁹ Four times John Paul II repeats a specific example, overturning the inheritance of an Aristotelian polarity which had said that a woman ought to obey her husband because of her inferior nature, and a Christian polarity which said that a wife ought to obey her husband as punishment for Eve's sin. 'The Gospel Innovation,' (in which in the relation between Christ and the Church the subjection is one-sided), asks wives and husbands to act in "mutual subjection out of reverence for Christ" (#24). He repeats what was just emphasized: "in the relationship between husband and wife the 'subjection' is not one-sided but mutual;" and to be sure that his readers understand its seriousness, he describes it as a call and an obligation: "the awareness that in marriage there is a mutual 'subjection of the spouses out of reverence for Christ,' and not just that of the wife to the husband, must gradually establish itself in hearts, consciences, behavior and customs" of every generation (#24).

Now in section #24, Pope John Paul introduces what he calls "The Gospel 'Innovation,' namely, that in marriage there is to be 'a new way: as a mutual subjection

²⁸ See "The Danvers Statement" of 1987 and John Piper and Wayne Grudem, *What's the Difference? Manhood and Womanhood Defined According to the Bible* (1990); *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (1991); *50 Crucial Questions about Manhood and Womanhood* (1992); and *Can our Differences be Settled? A Detailed Response to the Evangelical Feminist Position Statement of Christians for Biblical Equality* (1992).

²⁹ John Paul II, *Mulieris dignitatem (On the Dignity and Vocation of Women)* (Boston: St. Paul Books and Media, 1988), #6.

out of reverence for Christ”(#24). He differentiates between the relation of husband and wife and the relation of Christ and the Church: “whereas in the relationship between Christ and the Church the subjection is only on the part of the Church, in the relationship between husband and wife the ‘subjection’ is not one-sided but mutual;” and he adds: “In relation to the ‘old’ this is evidently something ‘new’: it is an innovation of the Gospel” (#24).

Just to be sure that the reader understands how significant this innovation of the Gospel is, Pope John Paul repeats it two more times, each time increasing its urgency.

First,

The “innovation” of Christ is a fact: it constitutes the unambiguous content of the evangelical message and is the result of the Redemption. However, the awareness that in marriage there is mutual “subjection of the spouses out of reverence for Christ,” and not just that of the wife to the husband, must gradually establish itself in the hearts, consciences, behavior and customs. It is a call which from that time onwards does not cease to challenge succeeding generations; it is a call which people have to accept ever anew(#24).

Second, commenting earlier on why this innovation is so important for a woman’s nature and dignity, the Holy Father remarked: “In this love there is a fundamental *affirmation of the woman as a person*. This affirmation makes it possible for the female personality to develop fully and be enriched”(#24). Before this innovation women were often thought of by philosophers and theologians to be subject to men because of a weakness of their nature. But John Paul II sets all those previous claims to rest with his definitive view: “But the challenge presented by the “ethos” of the Redemption is clear and definitive. All the reasons in favor of the “subjection” of woman to man in marriage must be understood in the sense of a “mutual subjection” of both “out of reverence for Christ.” (#24)

The Debate about the meaning of 'homosexual complementarity'

2 c ad note
at
begin

An argument for homosexual complementarity in marriage proposed by Todd Salzman and Michael Lawler in *The Sexual Person* suggests that personal complementarity could be fulfilled as a 'holistic complementarity' between two homosexuals who would not have biological complementarity.³⁰ They falsely ascribe this dualism to Magisterial teaching about marriage, dividing it into a personal complementarity and a biological complementarity. This faulty argument confuses different aspects of complementarity relations between a man and a woman, each of whom is an integral composite human being, with different so-called complementary parts of persons in relation. In this distortion, the prime meaning of complementarity is based on states of consciousness with desires and pleasures, rather than on the call to union of two ontologically complementary beings.

Once again we see the echo of a Cartesian dualism, developed in part upon a further erroneous division by the English philosopher John Locke (1632-1704) who had claimed that personal identity of a man may be attributed only to his self-consciousness as the same person, but his identity as the same man is attributable only to his having the same material body.³¹ Although this book ironically 'won' the 2009 First Place in Catholic Theology Award, excellent critiques of its distortions have recently been given. Christian Brugger shows the underlying Cartesian dualism in the distortion, Patrick Lee and Robert George show the distortions about natural law contained with it; and the

³⁰ Todd A. Salzmänn and Michael G. Lawler, *The Sexual Person: Toward a Renewed Catholic Anthropology* (Georgetown: University Press, 2009), 124-61.

³¹ John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1996), sections on Identity of Man and Personal Identity, Book II, chapter 27, sections 6-26.

Committee on Doctrine of the USCCB, especially notes the dualistic view of the human person in their critique.³²

While theologians speak about heresies, philosophers speak about errors, distortions, and decays. In the face of these tests for the living idea of integral complementarity of woman and man, time will tell whether there is adequate vigor in those defending the *hylomorphic* foundation and each of the essential elements of integral complementarity to revitalize its defense in the face of corruptions or perversions of its truth. In describing this seventh criteria Newman offers the following:

We have arrived at length at the seventh and last test, which was laid down when we started, for distinguishing the true development of an idea from its corruptions and perversions: it is this. A corruption, if vigorous, is of brief duration, runs itself out quickly, and ends in death; on the other hand, if it lasts it fails in vigour and passes into a decay. This general law gives us additional assistance in determining the character of the developments of Christianity commonly called Catholic.³³

Catholic Attorneys and Journalists Map the Gender Ideology Virus

From the 1990's to the present four persons have done a remarkable work in mapping what I have called the 'gender ideology virus' as it traveled through out the world taking root in willing hosts. Two of these mappers are Catholic attorneys, Mary Ann Glendon and Christopher Smith; and two of the mappers are professional Catholic journalists, Dale O'Leary and Marguerite A. Peeters. Their work to alert the rest of us concerning how gender ideology has gone viral is invaluable and provides a crucial foundation for our further thinking and action.

³² Christian Brugger, "Dualism and Homosexual 'Complementarity': A Reply to Salzman and Lawler," *Josephinum Journal of Theology*, vol 14, no. 2 (Summer/Fall 2007): 218-239; Patrick Lee and Robert P. George, *Body-Self Dualism in Contemporary Ethics and Politics* (Cambridge: University Press, 2008); and USCCB Committee on Doctrine, Inadequacies in the Theological Methodologies and conclusion of *The Sexual Person: Toward a Renewed Catholic Anthropology* by Todd A. Salzman and Michael G. Lawler (September 15, 2010).

³³ Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, 437.

At the same time, I am in disagreement about one aspect of the solution the two journalists suggest to overcome the spread of gender ideology. In brief, they argue that we should avoid using the word 'gender' and instead restrict ourselves to using only the word 'sex.'³⁴ My argument against this position is that the word 'gender', has already become the common word used for man or woman, male or female on applications for airplane flights, visas, universities, and so on. If we are to simply ignore it, just like ignoring a virus, its distorted version of gender ideology will continue to spread, and isolation to simply the word sex will become increasingly ineffective. Instead I think that we should attempt to ransom the word gender, much like John Paul II ransomed the word 'feminism' by introducing the 'new feminism' of the true meaning of feminism which is based on the common good of women and of all persons including men and children.³⁵ Before offering some philosophical reasons for ransoming gender reality from gender ideology, I will offer a time-line of the world-wide expansion in gender ideology, with references to the four authors who mapped its expansion.

~~1975~~ ¹⁹⁷⁵ In ^{called for} 1975, the United Nations organized a world conference in Mexico City for the UN Year of the Woman. In ~~1994~~ ¹⁹⁹⁴ ¹⁹⁷⁴ preparations were being made in different regional meetings of Non Governmental Organizations (NGO's). The regional conference for Latin American met in Mar del Plato, Argentina. At that conference Senora Marta Llama, a Mexican Feminist, proposed a theory of five sexes. Her words sound like a carbon copy of Dr. John Money's theory:

³⁴ See Dale O'Leary, "Don't Say Gender when you mean Sex." Available from Pontifical Council on the Laity: Women's Section (January-February 2012), 1-5, here 2; and "Interview with Marguerite A. Peeters on the gender theory," Available from Pontifical Council on the Laity: Women's Section (November-December 2011), 1-2.

³⁵ See (Sr.) Prudence Allen, "Ransoming Treasured Words," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, volume CVI, no. 6 (March 2006): 22-29.

Biology shows that, outwardly, human beings can be divided into two sexes; nevertheless, there are more combinations that result from the five physiological areas which, in general and very simple terms, determine what is called the biological sex of a person: genes, hormones, gonads, internal reproductive organs and external reproductive organs (genitals). These areas control the five types of biological processes in a continuum... A quick but somewhat insufficient classification of these combinations obliges one to recognize at least five biological sexes: men (persons who have two testicles); women (persons who have two ovaries); hermaphrodites or herms (in which there are at the same time one testicle and one ovary); masculine hermaphrodites or merms (persons who have testicles, but present other feminine sexual characteristics; [and] feminine hermaphrodites or ferms (persons with ovaries, but with masculine sexual characteristics).³⁶

In addition to this proposal for five equal sexes, Senora Marta Llama also argued that a person's identity as a man or woman is simply socially constructed. She often spoke of gender and defined it as: "the symbolization that each culture establishes over sexual difference."³⁷

During September 1-4, 1994, representatives from 179 governments around the world met in Cairo for a United Nations Program of Action on a variety of global issues. A large group of NGO's met just before the UN in Cairo. At this conference a rather intense argument erupted over the meaning of the word "gender" which was frequently used in a draft text. American Congresswoman Bella Abzug, tried to redefine gender, or blur distinctions when others tried to stop her.³⁸ Bella Abzug's own words reveal deeper philosophical positions. First, following the line of thought that a woman's body imprisons her previously articulated by Simone de Beauvoir in *The Second Sex*, Abzug rejects the significant place of sexual identity within one's gender identity ["The current attempt by several Member States to expunge the word gender from the Platform for

³⁶ Marta Llamas, "Cuerpo: Diferencia sexual y género", in Dale O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda: Redefining Equality* (Lafayette, Louisiana: Vital Issues Press, 1997), 69-70.

³⁷ Llamas, "Cuerpo," in O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 71.

³⁸ For a thorough description of the arguments and tactics, see O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 86ff.

input
dates on
p. 56

Action and to replace it with the word sex is an insulting and demeaning attempt to reverse the gains made by women, to intimidate us, and to block further progress.”³⁹

Secondly, the argument about roles echoing Betty Friedan’s *The Feminist Mystique* is similarly aggressive: [“We urge the small number of male and female delegates seeking to sidetrack and sabotage the empowerment of women to cease this diversionary tactic. They will not succeed. They will only waste precious time. We will not go back to subordinate inferior roles.”]⁴⁰

The difficulty is that Bella Abzug’s definition of gender follows the sex/gender Cartesian separation. In her words “The meaning of the word gender has evolved as differentiated from the word sex to express the reality that women’s and men’s roles and status are socially constructed and subject to change.”⁴¹ In fact, her political position based on a kind of Cartesian unisex equality promoted abortion rights, the social construction of several sexes and genders. In the end, the ‘word’ gender was left vague to mean “as it has been commonly used and understood”, which was the problem in the first place.⁴²

It is at this point that gender ideology proponents sought to dominate the discussion and resolutions at the United Nations Fourth Conference on Women in Beijing, China in 1995 by redefining equality of men and women to mean statistical equality in every kind of work or political situation. As Dale O’Leary summarized it: “The Gender Agenda begins with a false premise—the differences between men and

³⁹ See O’Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 87.

⁴⁰ See O’Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 87.

⁴¹ See O’Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 86-87.

⁴² See O’Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 159.

women are social constructs—and then goes on to demand that this premise be ‘mainstreamed’ in every program and policy.”⁴³

At this point I would like to interject two antidotal pieces of information. In the first one, Congressman Chris Smith shared with the audience present at his key note address to the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars in Pittsburgh (2004)⁴⁴, that he had received anonymously a package which listed the ten or so steps that feminists had decided to take to circumvent the difficulty at that time of changing US law so that it would conform to its agenda. Among these steps was the plan to go first to the United Nations and get certain rights approved there (as it was easier to accomplish) and then return to the United States to argue that this country should conform itself to the international precedent established at the UN. Another step in the plan was to insert their own members into the middle tier of administrators, who took the UN policies and its finances out to all the world, and country by country to make sure they could be put in place. Chris Smith was at the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing and he worked hard to support the profamily and prolife groups at the conference.⁴⁵

In the second one, Mary Ann Glendon, Harvard Law Professor, addressed in Denver a group of several women about her experience leading the Vatican Delegation to the UN Conference in Beijing. Before going to the conference she told us about meeting with Pope John Paul II to received some of his guidelines for representing the Vatican’s

⁴³ O’Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 161.

⁴⁴ Representative Christopher H. Smith (R.-N.J.), Keynote Address “Pro-Family Prospects in the Congress,” Chapter 1 in Kenneth D. Whitehead, ed., *The Church, Marriage & the Family* (Notre Dame: St. Augustine’s Press, 2007), 1-10. Unfortunately these informal remarks in the context of his lecture are not included in the published written text. It is also worth noting that Chapter 20 in the same published text details the extraordinary negative effect of the “use of rapidly spreading pre-natal sex determination technology for gender-based abortion...” on the world-wide increasing numbers of abortion of female fetuses. See Nicholas Eberstate, “The Global War against Baby Girls An Update,” 341-362, here 362.

⁴⁵ O’Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 193-94.

Positions on Woman's Identity in the context of the other kinds of forces and arguments which will be present at the conference. Specifically, when she asked him how he might suggest responding to the multiple genders and sexes lobbies, the Holy Father suggested that she just stand up and say something like the following: "That is absurd. We know that men and women are everywhere in the world the two ways of being a human being."

In her written summary of the Vatican Delegation to Beijing, Mary Ann Glendon provided a welcome insight into the mind of John Paul II and to the conclusions of that conference.

... [o]ur assessment of their [the documents of the conference] pros and cons was communicated to the Vatican Secretariat of State. On Thursday morning, we received the Holy Father's decision: Accept what is positive, but vigorously reject what cannot be accepted.

Accordingly, the Holy See delegation associated itself in part, with several reservations, with the conference documents... A controversy over the word "gender" that loomed before the conference had been largely defused with a consensus that gender was to be understood according to ordinary usage in the United Nations context. The Holy See, however, deemed it prudent to attach to its reservations a further, more nuanced, statement of interpretation, in which it disassociated itself from rigid biological determinism as well as from the notion that sexual identity is indefinitely malleable. In keeping with the Holy Father's instruction to vigorously reject what was unacceptable, my concluding statement was sharply critical of the conference documents for the remaining deficiencies that our delegation had tried from the beginning to publicize and remedy.

The most important political lesson to be taken from the Beijing conference is that huge international conferences are not suitable settings for addressing complex questions of social and economic justice or grave issues of human rights. Unfortunately, there is an increasing tendency for advocates of causes that have failed to win acceptance through ordinary democratic processes to resort to the international arena, far removed (they hope) from scrutiny and accountability... [They] can be expected to keep on trying to insert their least popular ideas into U.N. documents for unveiling at home as "international norms"⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Mary Ann Glendon, "What Happened at Beijing," *Traditions in Turmoil* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 2006), chapter 37: 301-13, here 310.

In 2006, the Pontifical Council for the Family produced a *Lexicon: Ambiguous and debatable terms regarding family life and ethical questions*. In this lexicon there are two essays on the meaning of 'gender.' In the article called "Gender" by Jutta Burggraf, after tracing the history of the word, the question is left open about whether or not to use the word 'gender'. While not accepting "the ideology of gender", Jutta Burggraf proposes a "gender perspective". She concludes: "This 'gender perspective' that defends the right to differences between men and women, and promotes co-responsibility in work and family, should not be confused with the radical proposal used at the beginning of this discussion, that ignores and crushes the natural differences between both sexes."⁴⁷

In the same *Lexicon* Oscar Alzamore Revoredo defines gender in "An Ideology of Gender: Dangers and Scope" drawing from the UN conference in Beijing: "Gender refers to the relations between men and women based on the socially defined roles assigned to one sex or the other."⁴⁸ Then, drawing from his experience of the regional conference at Mar de Plato, Argentina Revoredo cautions: "It becomes clear that the supporters of the gender perspective were advancing something more reckless, like, for example, 'a natural man or woman does not exist...'"⁴⁹ These two conflicting positions in the *Lexicon* of ambiguous terms leave the position open for further study and clarification.

The final person to be considered in this section on mapping the virus of gender ideology is Dr. Marguerite A Peeters, Journalist and Director of the Institute of Intercultural Dialogue Dynamics in Brussels, and faculty member of the Urbaniana

⁴⁷ Jutta Burggraf, "Gender", in Pontifical Council for the Family, *Lexicon: Ambiguous and debatable terms regarding family life and ethical questions* (Virginia: Human Life International, 2006): 399-408, here 408.

⁴⁸ Oscar Alzamore Revoredo defines gender in "An Ideology of Gender: Dangers and Scope" in *Lexicon*: 465-482, here 466.

⁴⁹ Revoredo, "An Ideology of Gender", 467.

Pontifical University. Dr. Peeters has written extensively on the ideology of gender and is at the forefront of mapping its intellectual and political expansions. In 2006, in the proceedings of a study seminar sponsored by the Vatican in 2004, Marguerite Peeters stated that:

ideology *tot*
The concept of gender breaks the ontological unity of the human person by separating the body from an individual's personal vocation as a man or a woman, a father or a mother, a husband or wife, a son or daughter; it breaks down the Trinitarian image of the human person. It therefore opens the floodgates to every type of possible choice regarding sexual orientation: bisexuality, homosexuality, lesbianism, heterosexuality, all of which are choices that the new ethical system places on the same plane in a form of radical moral relativism.

The deconstruction of the person as a man or as a woman leads to a sexless society, a society without tenderness, a "neutral society without men and without women."⁵⁰

input 10/5/1
 From my perspective, Dr. Peeters is describing the ideology of gender and not the concept of gender itself. Nonetheless, her article very well maps the strategy of "gender mainstreaming, from 1968 Teheran, 1974 Bucharest, 1975 Mexico City, 1980 Copenhagen, 1985 Nairobi, and 1995 Beijing."⁵¹ Her work is an invaluable reference for the viral spread of gender ideology. Peeters correctly identifies that "In the gender revolution, the real power is wielded by experts... [who] are given direct access to senior civil servants and all the real decision-makers in every country, in order to be able to exert their influence without hindrance."⁵² And she prophesies correctly that "The gender revolution is spreading like wildfire, albeit silently, without any form of public debate, and without anyone feeling the need to give it any democratic legitimacy."⁵³

⁵⁰ Marguerite A. Peeters, "Current Proposals and the state of the debate," Pontificium Consilium Pro Laicis: Laity Today, *Men and Women Diversity and Mutual Complementarity* (Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2006):73-98, here 80. My emphasis.

⁵¹ Peeters, "Current Proposals," 85.

⁵² Peeters, "Current Proposals," 95.

⁵³ Peeters, "Current Proposals," 96.

In *The globalization of the western cultural revolution: key concepts, operational mechanisms* Marguerite Peeters elaborates in detail her basic approach to gender. While her mapping of the globalization of gender ideology is excellent, I still disagree with her conclusion to avoid the word 'gender' altogether and so will add the bracket [ideology] in my description of her arguments. Peters identifies a 'gender paradigm' supported by 'gender feminists' who "have established a dialectical distinction between the concept of sex, feminine or masculine, whose differences are written in biology and are therefore unchangeable, and gender, feminine or masculine, whose differences, according to them, are socially constructed, unstable, and changeable."⁵⁴

Peeters analyzes the rights- based approach strategy of gender [ideology]: "The first is the integration into human rights of the objectives of the erotic revolution...The second is the integration of socioeconomic development into human rights...;...and the post-modern right to choose."⁵⁵ She traces the Gender [ideology] mainstreaming at the UN and its use of "global gender [ideology] specialists through the UN's Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, or OSAGI."⁵⁶ In addition, Marguerite Peeters correctly describes a new battleground for gender ideology vs. gender reality in the field of education through a clear agenda from UNICEF for transforming schools in five stages: gender sensitive; gender healthy; gender priority to girl's education, gender rights of children to express their opinions and to have access to sexual and reproductive health; and evaluation on the children's positive participation in society.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Peeters, *The Globalization*, 71.

⁵⁵ Peeters, *The Globalization*, 88-89.

⁵⁶ Peeters, *The Globalization*, 131-33.

⁵⁷ Peeters, *The Globalization*, 161-62.

In 2008, Marguerite A. Peeters gave a lecture entitled “Gender: an anthropological deconstruction and a challenge for faith” at a conference sponsored by the Pontifical Council for the Laity in Rome on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of *Mulieris Dignitatem*. This lecture begins with the strong claim: “Gender is one of the most harmful categories in the feminist, sexual and cultural revolution that we are experiencing in the West.”⁵⁸ Here again, Peeters used the word ‘gender’ without the qualifier ‘ideology.’ Later in her presentation, Peeters argues further that “gender is not an ideology in the proper sense of the term,” because it did not flow from a master who created it like Marx and from a systematic great theory. Following this, she states that “Gender carries in its wake residue from feminism and Marxism...”⁵⁹. And, later on in her article, Peeters refers to gender ideology’s attack on mothers and on ‘man-woman complementarity.’ Finally, she returns to her simple use of the word ‘gender’ and concludes that “The concept of gender has the revolutionary objective of restructuring society according to a new model of gender equality.”⁶⁰ Unfortunately, in this article Peeters goes back and forth between using gender on its own and occasionally introducing the qualifier ideology of gender. It would seem that she still maintains that even the word ‘gender’ always carries with it all the residue of gender ideology.

⁵⁸ Marguerite A. Peeters, “Gender: an anthropological deconstruction and a challenge for faith”, in Pontifical Council for the Laity, *Woman and Man the humanum in its entirety* On the 20th anniversary of John Paul II’s Apostolic Letter *Mulieris Dignitatem*. 1998-2008) (Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2010): 289-299.

⁵⁹ Peeters, “Gender”, 290.

⁶⁰ Peeters, “Gender”, 297.

Conclusion: Newman's criteria for proof fulfilled in convergence of probabilities

Can we say that two phrases in the ninth clause of line of our Apostle's Creed, "I believe in... the Communion of Saints... , the resurrection of the dead " opens the way for philosophy to help theology come to clarity about the true meaning of the integral complementarity of woman and man? Newman points out that that "while a corruption is distinguished from decay by its energetic action, it is distinguished from a development by its transitory character."⁶¹ Finally, he asks us to consider the preponderance of evidence for the development of a living idea, as a kind of convergence of probabilities that makes it a true development. Let us conclude with his words:

The point to be ascertained is the unity and identity of the idea with itself through all stages of its development from first to last... To guarantee its own substantial unity, it must be seen to be one in type, one in its system of principles, one in its unitive power towards externals, one in its logical consecutiveness, one in the witness of its early phases to its later, one in its union of vigour with continuance, that is, in its tenacity.⁶²

⁶¹ Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, 204

⁶² Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, 206.

Handwritten notes in red ink, consisting of several horizontal lines and small dots, scattered across the upper half of the page. The lines are mostly horizontal and vary in length. Some lines have small dots at their ends. The dots are also scattered across the page, some appearing to be part of the lines and others separate. The handwriting is very faint and appears to be a series of short, disconnected strokes.

Handwritten notes in red ink, consisting of several horizontal lines and small dots, scattered across the lower half of the page. The lines are mostly horizontal and vary in length. Some lines have small dots at their ends. The dots are also scattered across the page, some appearing to be part of the lines and others separate. The handwriting is very faint and appears to be a series of short, disconnected strokes.